Election

In response to the restriction set forth in Paragraph 1 of the 20 May Office Action, Applicants hereby elect Group II, i.e., Claims 12-20, drawn to a process, classified in class 156, subclass 244.11.

Remarks

Applicants respectfully contend that in asserting the restriction requirement, the USPTO is taking the position that the inventions set forth in the designated groups are patentably distinct, i.e., patentable over one another, i.e., both novel and nonobvious over one another. As such, it is apparent that in issuing the restriction requirement, the PTO has gone on record as admitting that even if the prior art were to disclose the subject matter within the claims of Group I, the claims of Group II would remain patentable thereover, and vice versa. If such an admission is not considered by the PTO to be desired in the instant application, Applicants suggest that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

In view of the position taken by the Patent Office that the subject matter of Group I is patentable over the subject matter of Group II, and vice versa, Applicants acquiesce to the restriction requirement without traverse, directing attention to the above-described effect of the restriction requirement.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rupert B. Hurley Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,313

Cryovac, Inc.
Law Department
P.O. Box 464
Duncan, SC 29334
(864) 433-3247

19 June 2003
DATE